ST

UNITED NATIONS

SECRETARIAT

DISTR.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.4/SR.6
17 May 1963
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PREPARATION OF PLANS FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 21 February 1963, at 2.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Plans for the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 1775 (XVII); ST/SG/AC.4/1 to 5; ST/SG/AC.4/L.1, L.2, L.3/Rev.1, L.4/Rev.1) (continued)

PRESENT:

Chairman:	Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR	Argentina
Rapporteur:	Mr. DEMETROPOULOS	Greece
Members:	Mr. BARTON	Canada
	Mr. WIJEGOONAWARDENA	Ceylon
	Mr. BAYONA	Colombia
	Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ	Costa Rica
	Mr. ALCIVAR	Ecuador
	Mr. BOUQUIN	France
	Mr. ACHKAR	Guinea
	Mr. NABAVI	Iran
	Mr. SCOLAMIERO	Italy
	Mr. SAWAI	Japan
	Mrs. ROUSSEAU	Mali
	Mr. LUQMAN	Mauritania
	Mr. BAROODY	Saudi Arabia
	Mr. VEJJAJIVA	Thailand
	Mr. OSTROVSKY	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. ATTLEE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. MEANS	United States of America
	Mr. MARQUES-SERE	Uruguay
Representatives of specialized agencies:		
	Mr. REYMOND	International Labour Organisation
	Mr. ORR	Food and Agriculture Organization
	Mr. SALSAMENDI	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
	Mrs. LOSEY-MAPES	World Health Organization
Representative of the United Nations Children's Fund:		
	Mr. GERIN	
Secretariat:		
	Mr. HUMPHREY	Director, Division of Human Rights
	Mr. CULPEPPER	Secretary of the Committee

/...

PLANS FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1775 (XVII); ST/SG/AC.4/1 to 5; ST/SG/AC.4/L.1, L.2, L.3/Rev.1, L.4/Rev.1) (continued)

Mr. ORR (Food and Agriculture Organization), speaking on behalf of the Director-General of FAO, drew the attention of delegations to the world-wide Freedom from Hunger campaign launched by FAO and its relationship to human rights, in the hope that the Committee would decide to include that theme among those to be given prominence on the occasion of the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration. The year 1963 was a significant milestone in the Freedom from Hunger campaign: the week of 17 March had been proclaimed Freedom from Hunger Week and many steps had already been taken in that connexion all over the world. On 21 March, over 140 postal administrations would issue commemorative stamps; from 4 to 18 June a World Food Congress was to be held in Washington to coincide with the twentieth anniversary of the Hot Springs Conference at which it had been decided to establish FAO. The Congress would bring together experts who would review the progress achieved and recommend action to be taken. FAO had submitted certain suggestions with regard to Freedom from Hunger Week. When Human Rights Day was celebrated, FAO would of course place special emphasis on the Freedom from Hunger theme. Should the Committee consent to include that theme in the celebration it was planning, FAO was prepared to provide all the necessary details on what it proposed to do. For example, it might send a representative to the forthcoming session of the Commission on Human Rights to arrange for effective co-operation or adopt any other course suggested by the Committee.

Mr. MEANS (United States of America) expressed regret that most of the fifth meeting had been spent in a discussion which bore no relation to the Committee's agenda; while he did not wish to provoke another such discussion, he felt obliged to state the true facts. There had been some comment on the treatment of the coloured citizens of the United States and the action taken to protect their rights. While it was true that racial segregation existed in the United States, it was equally true that the United States Government was determined to take all the necessary steps to protect individual rights. Having

(Mr. Means, United States)

said that, he found it surprising that when racism in the United States was criticized there was never any protest against the racism prevailing in countries which prided themselves on being models of democracy.

A chapter had just been completed in the history of the determined struggle which a country deeply devoted to the principles of freedom and democracy had been waging for over a century to eradicate the last vestiges of prejudice and discrimination in all fields. The fact that it had been necessary to take steps to enable a citizen of Oxford, Mississippi, to enjoy full freedom was tragic and highly regrettable, but those steps represented a further advance towards full recognition of the sacred rights of the individual as proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. One of the advantages of a democratic society was that Government policy could be freely criticized; consequently, the United States Government readily accepted constructive criticism which might help it to make progress. He hoped that no nation would interpret the episode to which he had referred as a defeat or even a setback. On the contrary, the vigorous steps that had been taken clearly indicated the value which the Government and people of the United States placed on the individual; it was a triumph for free democratic institutions and demonstrated the resolute will of the public authorities not to yield to threats. The United States was determined not to relax its vigilance in the field of human rights; its President had not only declared that the court decisions must be respected and that the unity of the country would be preserved, but had categorically upheld the rights of the individual in his efforts to achieve happiness and dignity. The United States delegation realized that there would always be some delegations in the United Nations which would wrongfully accuse it and distort its words or exploit them for reprehensible political purposes; nevertheless it wished to state - and it was making a solemn, firm and irrevocable pledge - that so long as the the United States remained free and independent, its fundamental objective would be to ensure the right to life, liberty and happiness of the citizens of the fifty States, without distinction as to colour, belief, religion or national origin.

(Mr. Meana, United States)

No Member of the United Nations could honestly claim that discrimination and prejudice were unknown in its country. No civilization was exempt from those two evils; they were odious and pernicious, just as were the political prejudice and harassment which led to people being denied the right to choose the system and institutions which they thought best. How could the world remain indifferent to the ruthless slaughter of men whose only crime was to seek freedom? At the very moment when the United States was being accused of racism in the United Nations, fundamental human rights and freedom of association were being scandalously violated in the socialist countries: African students whose sole aim was to obtain education had been brutally treated, thrown into prison and publicly insulted because of their race and colour. The students had said that there was more racial discrimination in that communist country than in any of the so-called capitalist countries, and that not only was it no accident but the communist authorities themselves were responsible for it. In that connexion, he quoted extracts from the Ghana Times and the Ghana Evening News, which denounced all manifestations of racism with equal force, whether they occurred at Johannesburg, in Mississippi or at Sofia. It should also be pointed out that Malian and Ethiopian students had been subjected to similar treatment in Czechoslovakia: some of them had allegedly been forced to take part in political demonstrations against the United States. Why were those incidents passed over in silence? Why was no voice raised in condemnation of the socialist country, represented in the Committee itself, which had acquired more than 22,750,000 new subjects and 683,000 square miles of new territory since 1939? At the previous meeting the Soviet Union representative had spoken about the human rights in his country; while it was to be hoped that the situation was as he had described it, there were facts which led to other conclusions. Of the eight Member States which had abstained from voting on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, two were members of the Committee and one of those two was in fact the Soviet Union, whose Minister for Foreign Affairs had indicated at the time that his country could not vote in favour of the Declaration because it was unable to support some of the articles - which was tantamount to an admission that the concept of civil liberties was not endorsed by the Soviet Union Government. There was nothing surprising about such a statement; it was perfectly in keeping with the entire attitude of the Soviet Union with regard to human rights. While

(Mr. Means, United States)

it was true that the Soviet Constitution devoted sixteen articles to the fundamental rights and duties of citizens, what was bestowed with one hand was taken back with the other by the Code of Criminal Procedure.

As its authors themselves had admitted, the Russian revolution had sought to exterminate the middle class, and the world had in fact witnessed the liquidation of the Kulaks as a class: those of them who had not been deported to Siberia had been shot and the blood-baths of the 1930's showed what extremes had been resorted to. Mr. Khrushchev had of course admitted that those incidents were mistakes, but the facts remained. In that connexion, he quoted the following statement by Mr. Vychinsky, an expert on Soviet law: "The Soviet regime could not even grant individual liberties - including freedom of thought - to the dissident communists, and civil rights can only be exercised in conformity with the interests of the workers and to strengthen the foundations of the regime". Indeed, article 157 of the Soviet Code of Criminal Procedure gave the Minister for the Interior and the Public Prosecutor the discretionary power to deprive a citizen of all his rights - which was contrary to article 128 of the Constitution. In the view of the United States, the right to protest and to hold different opinions was a fundamental element of democracy, marking the difference between freedom and slavery. In that connexion, he recalled the statement made by President Truman in 1948, the second point of which reads as follows: "We believe that all men are entitled to freedom of thought, expression and religion".

His country, which was proud of its democratic institutions and of the progress it had made in the field of civil rights, could not allow any doubt to be cast on the sincerity of its efforts to eliminate regrettable abuses. The international community was quite capable of distinguishing between a Government which used its power to protect human rights and one which used its tanks and guns to crush those who aspired to freedom. He failed to see how anyone could be impressed by the hypocritical allegations of those whose firing squads, political purges and generally oppressive regime were notorious from East Berlin to Peiping.

/...

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) noted that, in its revised version, the report gave a lengthy account of the opinions expressed by the various delegations during the Committee's session. Nevertheless, his delegation would like it to include, for the guidance of the Commission on Human Rights, a suggestion based essentially on the third preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1775 (XVII). That paragraph should be taken into consideration, and in that connexion the Committee could ask the United Nations to publish a brochure on colonialism similar to the one which UNESCO had devoted to discrimination. The brochure would be in three parts: the first would describe the circumstances in which, since the adoption of the Universal Declaration, millions of men had won their freedom and were now represented in the United Nations; the second would indicate what remained to be done and describe the efforts made by the United Nations to help the remaining dependent territories to achieve independence; the third would show how the liberation of the colonial peoples was contributing to the advancement of mankind and the inauguration of a lasting peace. Such a brochure would not be controversial, for it would not attack any country but would limit itself to relating the facts. He hoped that his suggestion would be favourably received, particularly by the delegations which had stressed the need to struggle against racial discrimination, since the liberation of the colonial peoples was a factor which promoted the elimination of racial prejudices, and the victory of the peoples of Africa who were still under colonial rule would facilitate the liberation of all Africans, wherever they might be.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that he would have to take up the Committee's valuable time, but he felt compelled to answer the violent accusations which the United States representative had just made, because the latter had taken up a completely irresponsible course of slandering socialist countries by making false statements. He pointed out, in the first place, that the Soviet Union delegation had not specifically mentioned the United States at the previous meeting when it had stated that in some countries, human rights were losing ground instead of advancing and that racial discrimination was still very active. Those were facts which the General Assembly had brought to light in many of its resolutions and which the Soviet Union delegation was entitled to mention. It was very significant that the United States delegation

(Mr. Ostrovsky, USSR)

should have felt itself to be the target: it had had no difficulty in recognizing itself among the countries indicated and it no doubt had the best reasons in the world to interpret some general remarks regarding violations of the Universal Declaration as a direct criticism of its Government.

The substance of the United States argument was the following: violations of human rights were widespread in the United States but the public authorities were taking the necessary steps to rectify the abuses. The United States representative had thus spontaneously admitted that various forms of racial discrimination, persecution for political convictions, so-called investigations of loyalty or persecution for so-called anti-American activities and the like existed in his country. That admission meant that the representative of the United States Government admitted that his country was following the path of fascistasation in full disregard of democratic liberties. If the United States Government by its own admission, was in such an unfavourable position, it would do better not to raise its voice unduly; it would be acting more wisely if it took the vigorous steps required to remedy those flagrant violations of the Charter and the Universal Declaration. But instead the United States representative thought it possible to distort the facts alleging that some measures had been taken against those flagrant violations. Whom was he trying to delude? As soon as one opened the book "Discrimination - USA" by Senator Javits one could become acquainted with numerous facts. Twenty-seven million Americans, one-sixth of the whole population of the United States were being subjected to discrimination in their choice of a home solely because of the colour of their skin or because of the way they worshipped God; under the threat of physical persecution, millions of peoples were not admitted to the polling stations, they could not freely move in their own country nor study in the universities, etc.

That had been the situation in the past; it was still the case. What measures had the United States representative referred to? Up to the present time many racist laws which provided for racial discrimination had remained unchanged.

Having agreed that such a situation existed in the United States, the United States representative was trying to say that things were bad not only in his country, but also in the socialist countries. The United States delegation

(Mr. Ostrovsky, USSR)

had seen fit to slander the USSR and other socialist countries by affirming that democracy did not exist in the socialist countries. He had distorted statements by Mr. Khruschcev and Mr. Vychinsky, the articles of the Soviet Constitution and Code of Criminal Procedure to give a false impression about the situation in the USSR. Of course for those countries, unlike the capitalist countries, democracy did not consist in allowing individuals to choose every four years those representatives of the financial monopolies who were supposed to defend their interests. He then questioned whether the word democratic could be applied to a country in which the right to work was not guaranteed and an entire sector of the population was subject to exploitation and discrimination. Such fictitious democracy had nothing in common with true democracy as practised in the socialist countries, where all the powers were in the hands of the people but not in representatives and lackeys of monopolies. The advantages of socialist democracy clearly showed why, since 1939, the world had undergone such changes and socialism had become an international system. The United States representative had referred to acts of violence in the USSR, but the Government and the Communist Party had resorted to force only after being compelled to do so by enemies of the revolution and particularly by the foreign Powers - among them the United States - which had invaded Soviet territory. The capitalist countries had never stopped their efforts, in disregard of international law and in opposition to the logic of history, to check the revolutionary advances of the socialist countries through subversive activities and now the United States Government was pursuing that policy further. The United States representative had alluded to firing squads; but when a country was faced with subversive manoeuvres financed by foreign Powers, it could hardly fail to take the necessary security measures. The Soviet people, having defeated foreign invasion by force of arms, was equally prepared to meet subversion with the appropriate counter-measures. If the United States representative thought that a State could allow itself to be destroyed by its enemies without acting in its own defence, he was sadly mistaken. The Soviet State had all the more reason to defend itself as it truly expressed the wishes of its people: no financial monopoly could seize power, since the means of production were collectively owned. Democracy as it was understood in the socialist countries was truly progressive, for it served the interests of the

/...

(Mr. Ostrovsky, USSR)

vast majority of the population and now in the USSR it served the interests of all the population; that was sufficient justification for the steps taken by the Soviet people against all the enemies of the Revolution, Kulaks among them, who with the support of the United States and other Western countries had begun a vicious fight against the revolutionary achievements and victories of the Soviet people. That group of population had represented only an insignificant minority and had been interested only in exploiting their fellow countrymen.

Regarding the vote cast by the USSR delegation at the time of the adoption of the Universal Declaration, he explained that the USSR delegation had been obliged to abstain because it had failed to secure the incorporation in the Declaration of the principle of self-determination - later proclaimed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) - and because in its view the text put to the vote did not go far enough and was not couched in sufficiently strong terms. It was absurd to claim that the USSR delegation had opposed the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration, when in fact it had wanted to strengthen them. On the question of self-determination of peoples, everyone knew the position of the United States Government, which sought to extend its rule to other States by the basest means - corruption, violence, pillage, blackmail and espionage - and was helping Portugal and South Africa to retain their hold on African territories. That country, which had not supported the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, was giving all its support and assistance to colonizers. That was the policy followed by a country which claimed to belong to "the free world". The policy of that country had been unmasked in the book "The Shark and the Sardines" by Dr. Arevalo, former President of Guatemala.

With respect to the charges against Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia made on the basis of newspaper articles, he said that the United States delegation had no information on what happened in those countries. It would be dishonest to publicize this allegation of discrimination on the basis of reports appearing in the United States newspapers. He had no doubt that these reports could not be given credit.

The United States representative could not with any serious sense of responsibility make such affirmations officially. It was futile to try to divert attention from what was happening in the United States by criticizing the socialist

countries, where the people were truly the masters of their fate and where some 100 different national groups enjoyed all fundamental freedoms fully and without discrimination. The United States delegation had clearly been ill-advised in its irresponsible decision to slander the socialist countries and the Soviet Union and make mendacious statements in the hope of justifying abuses which it did not even try to deny and which were tantamount to a total negation of human rights.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) remarked that the Rapporteur had complied very faithfully and objectively with the wishes of those delegations which, finding a reference to the summary records inadequate, had at the previous meeting asked that their views should be presented at some length in the Committee's report.

He wished to remind members that the item on the agenda was the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration, and to remark that mutual recriminations were both pointless and irrelevant. In the hope of avoiding a prolonged and sterile debate, and speaking not as the representative of Saudi Arabia but as a member of a committee responsible for drawing up plans which would lead to the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration being celebrated peacefully and joyously, he urged all delegations present to approve the report as it stood. The suggestion of the Guinean representative was very valuable, but if attention was to be drawn to the problem of colonialism it would be far better to request, for instance, that the competent United Nations bodies should fix a deadline for the total abolition of colonialism. Similarly, it was open to any delegation that was particularly concerned with the question of racial discrimination to ask to have the matter included in the agenda of the General Assembly. It would, however, be inappropriate to make either of those questions the theme of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration. Everyone was

(Mr. Barcody, Saudi Arabia)

aware of the vigorous stand his delegation had always taken against colonialism and racial discrimination; it was as anxious as any other delegation to see those two evils rooted out, but it held that the Committee must display a spirit of objectivity and impartiality. Reviving old quarrels concerning different interpretations of the word democracy served no useful purpose. Emphasis should be placed not on those issues that divided nations, but on what bound them together, in particular their common adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

He therefore urged all delegations, and especially the Guinean delegation, not to insist that explicit mention should be made in the list of suggestions and recommendations of any one aspect of human rights to which they attached special importance.

Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) said that, while the publication of a brochure on colonialism was an interesting possibility, it might place the Secretary-General in a difficult position. Indeed, how could the Secretary-General draw up a list of dependent territories if he did not have the report of the Committee of Twenty-Four? Moreover, the United Kingdom could not for its part accept a list which did not mention the territories under the Soviet yoke.

Mr. BOUQUIN (France) said that he had refrained from speaking at the previous meeting in order not to prolong an already long debate. The Rapporteur had amended the draft report in compliance with the request made by the USSR and other delegations. The revised text of paragraph 9 was well drafted; it mainly summarized what had been said at the preceding meeting, but also referred to the summary records of earlier meetings. His delegation would have no difficulty in voting for the draft report.

The representative of Guinea had proposed the publication of a brochure on colonialism. While resolution 1514 (XV) was of course mentioned in the preamble of resolution 1775 (XVII), the Committee should confine itself to the question of the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration. The Declaration proclaimed rights which should be guaranteed to all by Governments

(Mr. Bouquin, France)

through national measures or international conventions. Resolution 1514 (XV), on the other hand, reaffirmed the right of peoples to self-determination, a political principle which involved relations between States and between peoples. If the two ideas were confused, the impression would be given that the problem of human rights arose only in the colonial countries. Nothing could be further from the truth. It had been stressed that the situation in regard to the respect for human rights still left much to be desired in many areas of the world and that in some non-self-governing areas a standard had been achieved which compared favourably even with that of some independent countries. It was dangerous to attach more importance to some countries than to others and to dwell on a phenomenon which was in the process of vanishing. When colonialism had disappeared, the problem of human rights would still not be solved. It was therefore that problem, considered from a universal point of view, that the Committee should tackle. Moreover, the peoples whom the Guinean representative had had in mind were not neglected in the Universal Declaration. The preamble clearly stated that the purpose of the Declaration was to ensure the observance of human rights both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

In view of the Special Committee's terms of reference, it would be better to refer the Guinean delegation's proposal to another United Nations body, such as the Committee of Twenty-Four. While he understood the reasons which had prompted that proposal, his delegation would be unable to support it.

Mr. BARTON (Canada) agreed with the Saudi Arabian representative that the Committee should proceed to the adoption of the draft report. The suggestion made by the Guinean delegation had merit, but, as had been said, it fell more within the competence of the Committee of Twenty-Four.

/...

(Mr. Barton, Canada)

The problem of human rights concerned the rights of the individual and of nations in all their aspects. Progress in that field depended on measures taken at the national level in all countries.

In conclusion, he congratulated the officers of the Committee on their excellent work and strongly urged the Committee to adopt the draft report in its present form.

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) noted that some representatives thought it would be biased to lay stress on the right of self-determination. There was nothing discriminatory about the UNESCO brochure on racism. How could a brochure devoted to colonialism be discriminatory, when colonialism was the most serious violation of human rights? The United Kingdom representative had maintained that the Secretary-General would have difficulty in drawing up a list of colonies. However, resolution 1541 (XV) had laid down criteria for determining whether or not a country had in fact attained independence. In any case, he would maintain the first part of his proposal. The positive nature of decolonization could be brought out even without a list. A brochure which assessed the actual situation could not give rise to any objections.

He feared that his proposal had been interpreted in too wide a sense. He was categorically opposed to any statement that human rights were more respected in a given colony than in some independent States. Nothing could be further from the truth. There could be no human rights when a whole people was deprived of its right to live as it saw fit.

His delegation would therefore reserve its position until it knew the fate of its suggestion.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was pleased to note that the gaps which had existed in the draft report had now been filled. Paragraph 9 seemed to be acceptable as a whole, but he must nevertheless express certain reservations. He wondered why the opinion expressed in the third sentence had been attributed to "some" representatives. He had thought that all delegations had wished to lay stress on the question of colonialism. The word "some" should therefore be replaced by "the". Moreover, the last sentence of paragraph 9 seemed to justify colonialism and to contradict the Declaration on the granting

of independence to colonial countries and peoples, as well as other General Assembly resolutions on colonialism. He would not press for the deletion of that sentence, but thought that instead of saying "some other delegates", the Rapporteur should give the name of the representative who had in fact expressed such an opinion.

He would have no difficulty in supporting the Guinean proposal. The Mauritanian representative had also shown the need for the publication of such a brochure. Mention of it should be made in paragraph 9, since the proposal had already been made in the Sub-Committee, and it should also be stated that some delegations had opposed the idea.

An attempt had been made to describe colonialism as a complex problem. But that question had been unambiguously dealt with in several General Assembly resolutions and it was not by chance that the Declaration on the granting of independence had been mentioned in resolution 1775 (XVII). Replying to the United Kingdom representative, he said that the attempt of the representative of the United Kingdom to divert attention from the blood-stained colonial policy of Great Britain, and to slander socialist countries could not be considered otherwise but unworthy.

He wished to point out that it was not generosity that had prompted the United Kingdom to grant independence to some of its colonies. Those colonies had liberated themselves after bitter struggles.

Where the Universal Declaration was concerned, his delegation had abstained during the vote because some of the provisions had not, in its opinion, adequately ensured respect for fundamental freedoms and human rights. The Soviet Union, moreover, advocated the drafting of a covenant on human rights, but it was aware that some countries created obstacles before the adoption of the covenants and declared that they would not sign them.

Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ (Costa Rica) recalled that the present meeting was to have been devoted exclusively to the adoption of the final report. The revised text adequately summarized the discussion at previous meetings and especially that at the preceding meeting.

(Mr. Volio Jimenez, Costa Rica)

The Guinean representative's proposal was very important; unfortunately, the Committee did not have the time to devote to it all the attention it deserved. Nevertheless, that proposal would appear in the summary record and would come before the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation supported the idea of making a historical survey of decolonization, either in a separate brochure or as a part of the history of the Universal Declaration, for the United Nations had every reason to be proud of the part it had played in that movement. The phenomenon of decolonization and the role of the United Nations could be mentioned in sub-paragraph (e) (p. 7). He therefore suggested that the Guinean proposal should be considered by the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) again congratulated the Rapporteur and fully supported the Guinean proposal. The additional work and cost which that proposal would involve would be minimal in comparison with the practical results it would produce. There would be no point in mentioning the Administering Powers in the brochure or in describing the conditions prevailing in the Non-Self-Governing Territories; it would be enough merely to enumerate those Territories. In that regard, it would be well to refer to the brochure in sub-paragraph (e) (p. 7). Far from harming the report as a whole, such a reference would only increase its importance.

If the Guinean delegation's proposal was rejected, the Rapporteur could perhaps insert in the introduction to the report a paragraph stating that some delegations had urged the Committee to adopt the idea of a brochure such as those mentioned in the report. He hoped that that suggestion would enable the Committee to adopt the report unanimously.

Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) also congratulated the Rapporteur on the excellent report. He was entirely satisfied with paragraph 9 and did not understand the criticisms of the USSR representative. He found the suggestion made by the representative of Mauritania acceptable.

(Mr. Attlee, United Kingdom)

The representative of Guinea had stated that, in the colonized countries, human rights were non-existent. He was sorry to have to contradict that representative but it was undeniable that, in the territories administered by the United Kingdom, everyone in effect enjoyed to a high degree almost all the fundamental rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration. In that connexion, he quoted a passage from a book written by a Somali who had studied at Prague. The author recounted that a woman had been arrested at Prague for having criticized the régime, and pointed out that, in Somalia, people who had publicly denounced the British authorities had not on that account been put in prison.

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) accepted the proposal of the representative of Costa Rica that the movement for decolonization should be mentioned in sub-paragraph (e) (p. 7). In reply to the United Kingdom representative, he reaffirmed that, as far as his own delegation was concerned, so long as an entire people was denied the right to manage its own affairs all other rights were unimportant.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the United Kingdom representative that the views of some delegations on the subject of colonialism were those of the majority, as was proved by the Declaration on the granting of independence which the General Assembly had adopted. So far as the situation in Czechoslovakia was concerned, he categorically rejected the groundless assertions made by the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) warned the Committee that it would be dangerous to recommend that a pamphlet on colonialism be issued or that a chapter devoted to that question be inserted in the history of human rights. The Secretariat would have to take into account all the views expressed, and there would be nothing to prevent a Member State from requesting that the pamphlet should contain an analysis of neo-colonialism. The anniversary of the Universal Declaration should not be used as a pretext for accusations and recriminations.

He sympathized with Guinea's desire to help the Africans, but experience had shown that some situations could be exploited in the interests of the "cold war". Moreover, it was not through the Universal Declaration that certain peoples had liberated themselves, but through their own efforts.

/...

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

He urged all the members of the Committee to adopt the draft report as it stood.

Mr. BAYONA (Colombia) supported the draft report in its existing form. He agreed with the representative of Guinea that what the United Nations had achieved in the field of decolonization had already had, and would always have, an effect on the full enjoyment of human rights. He endorsed the suggestion of the representative of Costa Rica that, in sub-paragraph (e) (p. 7), the Rapporteur should draw the attention of the Secretariat to the desirability of including an additional chapter on decolonization.

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he did not understand the fears of the Saudi Arabian representative. If fear of the "cold war" made it impossible to speak of decolonization, all hope was lost. His delegation found it difficult to adopt the draft report in its present form, because some delegations, including that of Guinea, had not taken part in the work of the Sub-Committee. He requested that the Costa Rican proposal be put to the vote.

Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) regretted the assertions made by the Soviet Union representative. It had always been the policy of successive British Governments to see that colonized peoples attained independence by a methodical process. The United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had different views about the speed of that process, but their objectives were the same. He ventured to state, however, that one of the fundamental freedoms - freedom of expression - was better observed in Somalia than in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) feared lest the fifteenth anniversary of the Declaration might reveal to the world, even more openly, the differences of opinion which existed in the Committee. The Committee should, however, try to prevent that. As was favoured by the representatives of Costa Rica, Guinea, Mauritania, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, the best solution would be to suggest to the Commission on Human Rights the possibility of making special mention of colonialism, racial discrimination and religious intolerance, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Declaration. That would

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

be better than asking the Rapporteur to change his draft report once again - which would require another meeting, since the Committee could not adopt the report until it had seen the final text. A reading of the report in conjunction with the summary records of the Committee's meetings would reveal not only the content of the Guinean proposal but also, as the Soviet Union representative had requested, the position adopted by each delegation with regard to a particular question.

Mr. DEMETROPOULOS (Greece), Rapporteur, asked whether the Committee would accept, by way of reference to the present meeting, the insertion, at the end of paragraph 9 of the report, of the following sentence:

"With reference to this debate, the Committee also discussed at some length the suggestion that a study should be made of developments and future prospects in the field of decolonization."

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that, while not wishing formally to reject the suggestion just made by the Rapporteur, he would have preferred the Chairman first to put to the vote the proposal made by the representative of Costa Rica and supported by the representative of Colombia.

Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador) proposed that the Costa Rican proposal be put to the vote immediately.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that it was high time to close the debate. He recalled, however, that he had received no reply to the two remarks he had made about paragraph 9 of the draft report. The Saudi Arabian representative was certainly right in stating that a reading of the summary records would suffice to show which delegations had supported a particular view, but it remained true that the report was too anonymous in character. In addition, the phrase "Some delegates", in the last sentence of paragraph 9, was incorrect, since only one representative had advanced the opinion in question. Finally, he was sorry that the United Kingdom representative considered it possible to repeat false accusations against Czechoslovakia, believing the moment was opportune because the representative of that country had not participated in the work of the Committee and thus had no possibility to give a suitable answer to the representative of the United Kingdom, whose position on that subject was dishonest.

/...

Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ (Costa Rica) formally presented his proposal, which had been supported by the representative of Colombia - viz. to insert after the words "progress already achieved", in paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (e) of the suggestions and recommendations (document ST/SG/AC.4/L.4/Rev.1, page 7), the following phrase: "including a brief and objective summary of the work accomplished by the United Nations in the process of decolonization."

Mr. MEANS (United States of America) apologized for taking time from the work of the Committee to reply to the statements made earlier by the representative of the Soviet Union, but he could not avoid answering such deliberate and malicious distortions and falsehoods.

He had never stated that violations of human rights were widespread in the United States; nothing in his statement - a written statement, copies of which had been given to the interpreters - referred to persecution for political convictions or to loyalty investigations.

If the USSR representative believed that an admission of imperfections in a society meant fascism, then his Government should engage in some self-examination and self-criticism, for never in history had there been a regime so imperfect, so brutal, so self-satisfied in its denial of all human rights, freedoms and dignities as that of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Khruschev had given to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a lurid account of the reign of terror under Stalin, who had ruled the USSR for a quarter of a century with never a word of open criticism against him during all that time.

The Soviet representative had charged, falsely, that the United States had used quotes from newspapers in the United States regarding the treatment of African students in communist countries. In fact, the United States had quoted from the Ghana Times and the Ghana Evening News.

He did not retract a single word of what he had stated regarding mistreatment of African students. As a matter of fact, the Bulgarian authorities had acknowledged difficulties in Bulgaria. Inasmuch as the USSR representative had reopened the question, he would like, with the permission of the Chairman, to complete his recitation of discrimination against African students, this time referring to the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Means, United States)

It might be well for the representative of the Soviet Union to soft-pedal the "virtues" of communist societies, especially in respect to non-discrimination, for it was well known throughout the world that the most segregated university was the Patrice Lumumba University, formerly known as the Peoples' Friendship University. That was also true of its subsidiary at Kiev. Complaints of discrimination because of race and colour at that university had reached vast proportions. African students had declared that they were not only discriminated against, but were also ostracized and not allowed to contact their embassies and ambassadors. Racial conflicts were commonplace, and violence and brutality were not lacking.

Not only did racial discrimination exist in the Soviet Union, but there was no remedy and no one to complain to, for the acceptance of a complaint would be an open acknowledgement of discrimination, and that the Soviet Union would never admit. Appeals to school authorities brought no action; appeals to the police came to naught. Thus, the Africans were left open to attack with no protection.

With reference to the United States statements on Mr. Vychinsky's speeches and writings, there was no distortion. If the Soviet representative would look up the unexpurgated record of Mr. Vychinsky's remarks at the time of the vote on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he would find that his then Foreign Minister had stated that his country could not guarantee freedom of religion. As to other statements by Mr. Vychinsky, he was somewhat surprised that the representative of the Soviet Union took the position that they were distorted; in fact, they were direct quotations. He stood by his statement that, what the Soviet Union gave with the Constitution in one hand, it took with the other in its Code of Criminal Procedure. That was why he had taken up the Committee's time to mention the precise articles of the Code of Criminal Procedure and of the Constitution.

The Soviet representative had spoken, not for the first time, of Senator Javits' book entitled Discrimination - U.S.A. Yet Senator Javits' remarks, which the Soviet representative had quoted, were based on material furnished by a non-governmental organization, and a religious one at that - the Society of Friends. It was indeed strange and hypocritical that the representative of a government which purported to have no faith in non-governmental organizations and which denied

/...

(Mr. Means, United States)

the validity of religion would use those sources as gospel. Incidentally, he would like to ask what would have happened to a citizen of the USSR if he had dared to make such comments on Soviet society?

Returning to the proposal of the representative of Costa Rica, he asked whether, in that case, the sentence would end with the word "decolonization" or whether the rest of the sentence, from the words "current endeavours" onwards, would be retained.

Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ (Costa Rica) replied that the end of the sentence would remain unaltered.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thought that the wording of paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (e) could be left as it was and that the following sentence could be added after that sub-paragraph: "A number of representatives proposed that the history should include a brief and objective summary of the work accomplished by the United Nations in the process of decolonization".

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that the representative of Saudi Arabia had in fact just made a new proposal; the Committee should first decide on the Costa Rican proposal.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there were two possibilities. On the one hand, the Committee could adopt the proposal of Costa Rica amending sub-paragraph (e). But as that sub-paragraph appeared in the suggestions and recommendations made by the Committee as a whole, it would not be possible, as the Saudi Arabian representative had proposed, to insert in it an opinion held by certain delegations only. On the other hand, the Committee could insert in another part of the report a paragraph indicating that certain delegations had stressed the need to make specific mention of decolonization.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) requested that the Committee should hold a further meeting, since he would like to be able to set forth certain other ideas on the matter. It would be a mistake to adopt in haste a text which had not been sufficiently studied; if the text of the draft report as it stood were put to the vote, he would have no choice but to abstain.

/...

Mr. FAYAD (Colombia) said that the proposal made by the representative of Costa Rica and supported by his own delegation had been designed simply to facilitate the Committee's task. If that proposal were put to the vote, its sponsors would accept the result, whatever it might be.

The CHAIRMAN, expressing the hope that it would be possible to avoid taking a vote the outcome of which might not be unanimity, suggested, as a compromise, the addition at the end of paragraph 9 of the following text:

"When the proposals set forth in section I of the suggestions and recommendations of the Committee, particularly those in paragraph 2 (e), were discussed, certain delegations suggested that the history of the Universal Declaration should include a brief and objective summary of the work accomplished by the United Nations in the process of decolonization."

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he too would have preferred not to have recourse to a vote. Nevertheless, a reasonable compromise text had been suggested; it should appear in the Committee's proposals, and not in the summary of the debate. Accordingly, his delegation formally proposed that the Costa Rican representative's proposal should be put to the vote.

Mr. BARCODY (Saudi Arabia) endorsed the suggestion made by the Chairman and formally proposed that it should be put to the vote first. If it was rejected, he would then support the Costa Rican proposal.

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he could not accept that suggestion, for the Saudi Arabian representative was actually making an entirely different proposal, under the guise of an amendment to the Costa Rican proposal. The latter should be put to the vote first.

Mr. BARCODY (Saudi Arabia) requested that the voting should be carried out, as was customary, in the order of the paragraphs of the report to which the amendments related. As he had submitted a formal amendment to paragraph 9 of the report, his proposal should be put to the vote first.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in conformity with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the Costa Rican proposal should be put to the vote first.

/...

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), supported by Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), suggested that the Chairman should consult the Committee with regard to the order in which the two proposals should be put to the vote.

The Committee decided, by 9 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions, that the Costa Rican proposal should be put to the vote first.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, requested a brief suspension of the meeting so that he might formulate certain amendments to the draft report.

After an exchange of views in which Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ (Costa Rica), Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) and Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that the voting on the Costa Rican proposal had already begun and could not be interrupted.

The Costa Rican proposal was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the beginning of the meeting the representative of the Soviet Union had proposed two amendments to paragraph 9 of the report. The first would entail the replacement of the word "some", in the fourth line of that paragraph, by the word "the".

Mr. MEANS (United States of America) said that he would prefer to retain the existing wording, which was closer to reality since some delegations, although not expression opposition, had not taken a stand on the point in question.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he believed that all the representatives had spoken against colonialism and he therefore proposed to change the word "some" by the word "the". If it was not the case and the USA and some other delegations had not taken an attitude against colonialism, of coutse it was not necessary to make changes in the report.

Mr. MEANS (United States of America) protested vigorously against the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union, which was a wilful and deliberate attempt to distort the United States position. To repeat, the existing text reflected the true situation, since many representatives had not expressed themselves on that question.

Mr. NABAVI (Iran) requested closure of the debate in accordance with rule 118.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the debate concerned not the draft resolution as a whole but only the proposed amendments.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure, amendments should be considered before the proposals to which they related. He asked whether the representative of the Soviet Union would agree to an amendment whereby the beginning of the last sentence of paragraph 9 would read: "One delegate pointed out ...".

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would be satisfied with that amendment.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), submitting a new amendment to the draft report, proposed the insertion, at the end of paragraph 9, of the following sentence:

"One of the delegates suggested that any literature which would be prepared by the United Nations should indicate concern about nuclear tests and their danger to human life."

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the draft report as a whole should be put to the vote.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that his delegation would vote for the draft report because it wished to give evidence of a constructive spirit; that by no means meant, however, that it was satisfied with the report or with the proposals which it contained. The Soviet Union must, in particular, dissociate itself categorically from certain statements made in the Committee in praise of colonialism. On the contrary, it considered that the year 1963 should be decisive in the struggle against colonialism, and it deeply regretted that the report mentioned no practical measure to that effect. The Soviet Union would have liked the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration to constitute a decisive stage in the progress of human rights throughout the world, instead of being limited to a purely formal celebration. Despite the defects to which it had drawn attention, it hoped that the fifteenth anniversary would have some practical value, and it would accordingly vote in favour of the draft report.

The draft report (ST/SG/AC.4/L.4/Rev.1) was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.